

Date: Fri, 12 Aug 94 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #370
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 12 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 370

Today's Topics:

 CW VIEWS (2 msgs)
 IARU reviewing CW re
 ITU Treaty
 Let's kick this idea around... (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 09 Aug 94 19:10:40 GMT
From: news2.new-york.net!starcomm.overleaf.com!n2ayj!n2ayj@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CW VIEWS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Sorry, got a little carried away flaming packet on that last one.
Please move the OTP replies elsewhere. Thanks for your understanding.

--

Stan Olochwoszcz, N2AYJ - n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com

Date: Tue, 09 Aug 94 19:07:25 GMT
From: news2.new-york.net!starcomm.overleaf.com!n2ayj!n2ayj@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CW VIEWS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <wyn.115.2E479881@ornl.gov> wyn@ornl.gov writes:

>No one is cramming CW down 'your' throats. There are gigahertz of frequencies
>to access without demonstrating competency in Morse code. If 'we' are so
>noble to want to stop the government from being an advocacy for any mode,
>let's campaign against the current NPRM to assign 132 KHz of HF spectrum to
>automatic packet data stations.

Just we we need - MECHANIZED lids that don't listen first! Where do I sign up?

Sorry, but IMHO, there's no place for big chunks of automatic operation
by machines in the HF bands. The whole idea of packet was 'hopping' along
the backbone to your destination. This was going to "save" 220, remember?
Look UP, packeteers; there's oodles of room at the Incredibly High
Frequencies. Keep packet where it belongs - up high on a tight beam at
LOW POWER, storing-and-forwarding as originally intended. Digital modes
were SUPPPOSED to make more efficient use of the bands. How, pray tell,
does cluttering HF with high-power (by their very nature) BAHRAAAAAPorators
accomplish this? Maybe I'm missing the point...

Educate me. From a purely hobbyist standpoint, how is this is fun?

HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
HI, THIS IS BOB'S MACHINE> IS CHARLIE'S MACHINE ON THE AIR? no reply
...ad nauseum

Superfluous communications if I ever heard 'em.

--

Stan Olochwoszcz, N2AYJ - n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com

"Any packets cutting in line to the gateway will be escorted from the park."

Date: Sun, 7 Aug 1994 08:18:25

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!hookup!
news.sprintlink.net!indirect.com!s146.phxslip.indirect.com!lenwink@ames.arpa

Subject: IARU reviewing CW re

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <40.2813.2427@channel1.com> alan.wilensky@channel1.com (Alan Wilensky) writes:

>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy

>Subject: Re: IARU reviewing CW re

>From: alan.wilensky@channel1.com (Alan Wilensky)

>Path: indirect.com!news.sprintlink.net!coyote.channel1.com!channel1!alan.wilensky

>Distribution: world

>Message-ID: <40.2813.2427@channel1.com>

>Date: Thu, 4 Aug 94 15:17:00 -0400

>Organization: Channel 1(R) 617-864-0100 Info

>Lines: 38

>LW>>In article <31m2fh\$6ld@scunix2.harvard.edu>, Yuzuru Suzuki wrote:

>LW>>> I saw some discussions about ITU's CW requirement for HF in this

>LW>>> Igroup. It is interesting that the IARU (International Amateur

>LW>>> Radio Union) has set up a Morse code ad hoc Committee to review

>LW>>> this requirement. I have this information from Morsum Magnificat,

>LW>>> a British CW magazine, number 34, June 1994, page 2. If many

>LW>>> people are interested in some more details, I will post another

>LW>>> article here. Please let me know if you would like more details.

>LW>>> My E-mail address is ys@isr.harvard.edu. Thanks.

>LW>>> 73, Yuzuru Suzuki, AA1JA

>LW>>Please post...

>LW>>Andy N3LCW

>LW>When I spoke to Dick Baldwin, (pres of IARU) last December, he did

>LW>say that many committees were studying whether to drop the

>LW>requirements or not. He did say times are changing. Dick will be my

>LW>guest on the Ham Radio & More show for September 25 and that subject

>LW>definitely will be discussed. 73, Len, KB7LPW

>Can I get a transcript of the show, or is it available in Boston, MA?

Yes, in Boston at 6:00pm EST, every Sunday, on WSSH, 1510am.

>Alan Wilensky, N1SSO

>General Manager

>Interactive Workplace Division

>Vicom, LTD.

>Phone: Edmonton Office
>11603 165 St.
>abm@world.std.com
>---
> CmpQwk #UNREG, UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

Date: Tue, 09 Aug 94 18:19:53 GMT
From: news2.new-york.net!starcomm.overleaf.com!n2ayj!n2ayj@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ITU Treaty
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <3281pg\$6g1@cat.cis.Brown.EDU> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu writes:

>There are many modes, and perhaps a test for each one of them would be
>too much hassle. However, we could break things down as follows:

- >
> 1. HF digital (Amtor, Pactor, RTTY, etc.)
> 2. SSB (all bands)
> 3. CW (all bands)
> 4. V/UHF FM voice
> 5. V/UHF digital (TCP/IP, Packet)
> 6. ATV / SSTV
> 7. Microwave (special considerations since we don't want people
> to cook themselves)

>
>So, you take your basic "intro" examination on station safety and
>FCC rules and regulations, then you pick the modes you wish to operate
>and take an examination on that mode.

Great idea, if you want the service to stagnate. By imposing that many restrictions via operation-by-certification, you negate one of the primary reasons the ARS exists, i.e., to encourage experimentation and development. In this regard, you need to know some radio theory. How else can you contribute to development of the technology?

Granted, there is not a lot of development going on to some minds, but what if operation-by-certification existed when someone came up with the idea of SSB, or FM-N and repeaters? The way the FCC works, we'd probably still be waiting for authorization. And witness the fact that, for all practical purposes, commercial protocols were imposed on packet when it was young and restless. AX.25 ain't all that original.

I don't disagree with having knowledge of how things work before you are authorized to operate, but IMHO the type of testing suggested already exists in the current licensing structure, it's just not being implemented as well as it could be. Publishing test questions instead

of making you actually learn SOMETHING about radio may be to blame.

--

Stan Olochwoszcz, N2AYJ - n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com

"This whole dot-dash concept sounds interesting, Mr. Vail. Why don't you let me look over your notes on the train to the Patent Office?" - S.F.B. Morse?

Date: Tue, 09 Aug 94 17:16:45 GMT

From: news2.new-york.net!starcomm.overleaf.com!n2ayj!n2ayj@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Let's kick this idea around...

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <3285hc\$svi@apakabar.cc.columbia.edu> jbaltz@merhaba.cc.columbia.edu writes:

>Use CB

>Those 49 MHz "handless talkies" you get at Radio Shack for \$100/pair.

>Telephone

>GMRS/CB (you can get CB walkie-talkies at RS cheap)

>Simple solution: get thy spouse/friend to a VE session.

>Or use an appropriate service.

Ditto.

--

Stan Olochwoszcz, N2AYJ - n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com

Technical Trainer/Technician/Broadcaster with semi-decent computer skills in Central NJ seeks work. E-mail fax number for resume, PLEASE.

Date: Tue, 09 Aug 1994 20:34:24 GMT

From: newshub.sdsu.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!

yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!

swiss.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!@ihnp4.ucsd.edu

Subject: Let's kick this idea around...

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <32810c\$09i@oak.oakland.edu>, prvalko (prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu) writes:

>Ok net.folk, what do you think of this...

>

>You are going on a trip with some non-ham friends or family in 2 cars...

>

>You are up on the roof working on something while a non-ham friend

>assists from the ground or basement...

>
>You are working with a neighbor on a TVI problem, he is in his house,
>you are in the shack transmitting...
>
>You are camping and your non-ham spouse/friend goes for a hike...
>
>--- I hope you get the idea...
>
>It would be nice if you could just toss them the HT, put it on some
>obscure simplex frequency, perhaps a 440 UHF freq, run it on the
>ultra-low power mode say under a watt, lock the keypad, and let them
>use the rig LEGALLY.
>
following proposed rules deleted for brevity...

No, no, no! There are plenty of other ways to accomplish these communications. I have a pair of CB handhelds and a pair of 49MHz radios for this kind of stuff. There is also GMRS and cellphone. There are at least four alternatives, with two of them at less than \$100 per pair of radios. Either use one of them, or (let's be honest), sneak your friend an HT and nobody will notice, but don't change the rules to allow non-licensed people to key up radios when a control-op isn't present. We don't need it!

73,
Mike, KK6GM

Date: 7 Aug 94 09:23:53 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!aspen.uml.edu!martinja@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <xfwGkiubGQ6G066yn@access.digex.net>, <320e60\$3tb@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>,
<080694160013Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
Subject : Re: CW ...IS history!

> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:
>>The FCC made a bo-bo.

Uh....is a bo-bo as bad as a boo-boo or worse? Really! I'm not sure! :)

de WK1V
-jim-

Date: Thu, 11 Aug 1994 03:09:00 EST
From: news.pipeline.com!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <31raar\$ai@ns.sunbelt.net>, <1994Aug7.164925.29832@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<wyn.113.2E4674CC@ornl.gov>v-lyon1
Subject : Re: CW VIEWS

wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. Wynn) writes:

>Who is kidding who here? Did you not agree with the necessity for the
>government to set aside, ie. extract, 132 KHz from the CW/RTTY/DATA HF bands
>including some of the novice segments, to support automatic packet station
>operation? Did you not support this government action by arguing that the
>HF amateur operators needed to modernize and accept channelization? No doubt,
>history will judge that this was a thinly veiled attempt to push out by QRMing,
>etc. the Morse operators from the band and to prop up an otherwise faltering
>attempt to establish packet operations in the HF subbands. Why?, could it
>be because the current rate of DWB growth in the HF subbands was not acceptable
>to the equipment manufacturers, salesmen and their agents? Apparently, you
>do support a government recruiting tool as long as it meets your agenda for
>your favorite mode.

Really? What is Gary's favorite mode? Gee, he has named so MANY!

>When you say "we" as in "What we are doing..." or "...we don't think ..."
>who are you referring to? If you are in reference to the present company
>of pro-no-coders, I believe if you review their record, you will see that
>many of your fellow travelers support banishment of CW operations. They
>demonstrate about as much tolerance for it as the SSB operators do for AM
>voice on HF

Please point out who supports the elimination of Continuous Wave
transmissions? There are MANY modes that are Continuous Wave. Or are you
convinced that only manually encoded morse is sent using continuous wave?

>It has demonstrated efficiency in the current market place and it does continue
>to hold up to 50% market share as Jeff has reminded you here many times. The
>only thing that will take it out is an aggressive campaign of disinformation
>as others have suggested here.

A market place where most are REQUIRED to pass a 13 WPM test to gain
access to the market? That would be like having an election and not
allowing Democrats to vote and see who gets elected. Gee, might be the
Republican? Or would the Democrat have a fair chance if all registered
Democrats were prohibited from casting a vote? (Come to think of it this
doesn't sound too bad... :-)

Dan

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #370
